

- 1. Tell us about your district team activities – i.e. how are you organized, how frequently have you met, any new members, any work groups, etc.?**

The Third Judicial District has ten collaborative teams organized around the juvenile judges and counties they are assigned to. The county(judge) teams include: Buena Vista-Cherokee-Ida (Judge Timko)/Crawford (Judge Schaefer)/Clay (Judge Schaefer)/Emmet-Kossuth-Palo Alto (Judge Bormann)/Dickinson-O'Brien-Osceola (Judge Larson)/Lyon (Judge Dull)/Monona Judge Jarman)/Plymouth (Judge Dull)/Sioux (Judge Michaelson)/Woodbury (Judge Sokolovske and Judge Michaelson)

A district team was formed to attend the first Court Improvement Project Summit in 2007 and helped to identify a work plan for the district. Another district team has been assembled for the 2009 and will continue to provide guidance/direction for district activities.

- 2. What have you accomplished from your work plan from Summit 2007?**
 - A. Formation of the Juvenile Court Committee (JCC) -includes ALL judges that do juvenile work in the district. The JCC meets quarterly.**
 - B. Adjust case assignments to have a one child/one judge case assignment system (since Oct 2006)**
 - C. Updated the Woodbury County Assessment completed by CIP**
 - D. Worked with CJI for completion of the Clay and Plymouth county assessments**
 - E. Surveyed juvenile judges in the district about county practices/procedures**
 - F. Modified court schedules in six counties to provide additional time for juvenile court: Woodbury, Kossuth, Plymouth, Buena Vista, Cherokee and Ida counties.**
 - G. Conducted a District Summit in November 2007**
 - H. Planning our next District Summit for May 28, 2009**
 - I. Hold regular meetings of the Juvenile Court Committee**

3. Tell us how you used your mini-grant funds?

Hold district-wide summits with all ten teams sending members of their multi-disciplinary teams.

4. Did you develop any materials, or changes that we can share?

A standard report form is used by each of the ten collaborative teams each time they meet. The information is shared with the chief judge and Juvenile Court Committee of the Third Judicial District. (Attached)

5. What successes did you have?

The county collaborative teams report the following successes: a) collaborating with domestic abuse coalition for improved client service, b) improved information sharing about mental health court orders, c) information sharing about program work, (Sioux) d) coordination with DMC efforts and the JDAI project, e) developing communication plan between education and agency providers, (Woodbury), f) improved understanding of GAL responsibilities/reports, g) training on the collaboration process, h) working to encourage more client involvement and in-court hearings, i) identify procedures for ex parte removals to ensure county attorney has information for the removal hearing, (Crawford), h) adjusting court schedule for CINA proceedings, i) working to improve GAL engagement, j) utilize PTCs for better case resolution (Lyon), j) adjustments in court schedules to better accommodate certain hearings, k) applications for court appointed attorneys faxed to the judge to speed the appointment process, l) GAL duty sheet sent to GAL when appointed, m) development of a community resources directory-printed in English and Spanish, n) cover sheets explaining the upcoming hearing will be attached to petitions and in multiple languages, o) CINA petitions include permission for GAL to talk to teachers and medical personnel (Cherokee-Ida-Buena Vista), p) improved scheduling practices (Plymouth), q) assignment of court attendant to assist with juvenile court, r) adjustment for more formal courtroom hearings, s) modification of the removal order to direct placements into relative care as first option, (Clay) t)

additional court time made available, u) better coordination between protective services worker and sheriff office, v) DHS use of colored paper for new recommendations/goals/narratives (Monona), w) increased use of CASA, x) increased communication between child protective worker and other entities (Dickinson-O'Brien-Osceola), y) use of pre-adjudicatory conferences on all delinquency and some CINA cases, z) changes in protocols to avoid appearance of ex parte communications, aa) more court time made available, bb) fewer continuances, cc) use of pre-adjudication hearings for better coordination of contested court hearings, dd) increased use of CASA, ee) county names on reports for better coordination, DHS listing reasonable efforts so judge can more easily review them (Emmet-Palo Alto-Kossuth)

6. What barriers got in your way of achieving your goals?

- A. Remedial services going into schools yet they not have to provide reports due to Title 19 so providers do not have any idea what services are being provided and what needs are going unmet.**
- B. Not enough qualified interpreters**
- C. Need one unified system for tracking student credits**
- D. Each school district has their own transfer policy**
- E. No uniform graduation requirements state-wide**
- F. Court support staff to conduct PTCs for the court**
- G. More resources for Family Team Meetings-use neutral facilitators**
- H. Kidsnet not effective – they not subcontract and unable to provide services (issue concerns placements also)**
- I. Foster Care Review Board not seen as helpful/useful**
- J. Lack of psychiatric services especially in rural areas**
- K. Waiting list for residential services**
- L. Sheriff transportation of youth in detention-centers not in county**
- M. Difficulty in connecting parents with needs with voluntary services faster (would prevent formal intervention)**
- N. Need authority to conduct telephonic hearings for shelter care/24/48 hr type hearings (232.22)**
- O. Need training for all on youth commitment processes/procedures/options**

P. Code 232.792c could be clearer about who is to be notified and by whom for hearings

7. What have you done to move closer to achieving the Supreme Court Goals for the district teams?

The SC goals included:

- I) Develop and implement specific strategies to meet the performance measures set out in federal ASFA and Iowa Code chapter 232 in all counties.**

District Response: At our district conferences we will be identifying specific initiatives for all ten teams to make progress on. The resource guideline checklists were provided to all ten teams at our 2007 district conference and will be again at our May 28, 2009 conference.

- II) Organize judicial resources and assignment so one judge makes all decisions in dependency cases involving one family.**

District Response: Assignments have been modified so we have one judge/one child since Oct. 2006.

- III) Conduct an assessment of effectiveness and timeliness of court practices in dependency cases.**

District Response: An assessment was completed with the CIP staff in Woodbury (2006) Plymouth and Clay counties (2007) and we have identified the next two counties to be assessed: Dickinson and Buena Vista.

